



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,322	05/10/2001	Lorenzo Casaccia	010317	5931
23696 7590 02/16/2011 QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121				
EXAMINER TORRES, MARCOS L				
ART UNIT 2617		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/16/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/853,322

**Applicant(s)**

CASACCIA ET AL.

**Examiner**

MARCOS L. TORRES

**Art Unit**

2617

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GB-06)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-3-2010

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12-2-2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding applicant's representative [hereinafter applicant] arguments that the prior office action was defective; the examiner was unable to find any contradiction in the examiner's arguments. The "determination and comparison in Bhatia" of the previous action mentioned by the applicant refers to the "determining at the mobile station the current indication and when receives the indication with higher QoS the mobile station blocks a call request by foregoing origination of the call request" which can be found in the same page 5, lines 6-9 of the office action mailed 9-2-10, and not to the determining of Siwko. Therefore, there is no contradiction in the examiner's arguments.
3. In view to applicant's arguments that Siwko teaches mobile station as not being part of Siwko network; none of the sections of Siwko presented by the applicant indicate that the mobile station is not part of a network. And the limitations network, system, network element are not necessarily the same. The rejection in record uses as a primary reference Bhatia which discloses broadcasting a priority which functions as a call request block, the mobile station determines based on the received information when to block a call request by preventing the origination of the call request (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41). When Siwko is added to Bhatia, since Bhatia already

broadcast the information for the mobile station to avoid the origination of the call; Bhatia could be modified to broadcast the call request probability of Siwko and permit the mobile station update or adjust the received information as taught by Siwko. So the mobile station can decide with the updated received information, whether to prevent or permit the origination of the call request and maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources. Therefore, the teachings of Siwko are added and not subtracted to the teachings of Bhatia.

4. As to applicant's arguments that neither Bhatia nor Siwko teach adjustment control based on something determined within the mobile station; as explained in the prior paragraph, none of the sections of Siwko presented by the applicant indicate that the mobile station is excluded from the network. Bhatia which discloses broadcasting a priority which functions as a call request block, the mobile station determines based on the received information when to block a call request by preventing the origination of the call request (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41). When Siwko is added to Bhatia, since Bhatia already broadcast the information for the mobile station to avoid the origination of the call; Bhatia could be modified to broadcast the call request probability of Siwko and permit the mobile station update or adjust the received information as taught by Siwko. So the mobile station can decide with the updated received information, whether to prevent or permit the origination of the call request and maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources. Therefore, the combination of the references does not teach away.

5. Also, applicant asserts that Bhatia fails to teach "receiving at a mobile station an initial call request block probability ... adjusting at the mobile station said initial call request block probability based on said elapsed time, said adjusted call request block probability identifying when the mobile station block a call request by foregoing origination of the call request, the examiner reminds the applicant that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Siwko discloses adjusting a initial call request block probability based on said elapsed time as shown in the current rejection; Redden discloses receiving at a mobile station an indication that the call request is going to be block as shown in page 14 and Bhatia discloses using a broadcasted indication according a priority identifying when the mobile station block a call request by foregoing origination of the call request (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41). Therefore, since the primary reference Bhatia discloses that the mobile station will block the call request will be based on the reception of apriority, loading parameter, the added teachings of Siwko would continue also in the mobile station as previously shown in the prior paragraph.
6. The rest of the arguments they fall for the same reasons as shown above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2617

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12-16, 18-20 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Bhatia 6112101 in view of Siwko (NPL XP-001017264).

As to claim 1, Bhatia discloses a method for blocking a call request when the assigned quality of service is unavailable, receiving at the mobile device an indication that the assigned quality of service is unavailable [100% call block probability]

determining at the mobile station the current indication and when receives the indication with higher QoS the mobile station blocks a call request by foregoing origination of the call request (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41). Bhatia fails to disclose determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial probability. In an analogous art, Siwko discloses a communication system using a method for blocking call request comprising: receiving an initial call dropping probability factor in a calculation to determine call admission or blocking, wherein the probability is determined by a network element; determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial probability; adjusting said initial call request block probability based on said elapsed time (see sections II-IV). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these teaching for the simple purpose of maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources. Siwko discloses that the receiving and adjusting occur at network element [note that network element can be any element connected to the network, including the mobile device], but it is silent regarding at which element is doing those task. However, since the determination and comparison in Bhatia is done at the mobile station. The combination of Siwsko will also be done in the mobile device too.

As to claim 2, Siwko discloses the method wherein said adjusting includes decreasing said initial call request block probability (see section III formulas) which is not disclosed by Bhatia. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these teaching for the simple purpose of maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources.

As to claims 3 and 20, Bhatia discloses the method further comprising: using said adjusted initial call request block probability to block a call request at a mobile station in said communication system (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41).

As to claims 4, 10 and 16, Siwko discloses the method of receiving a time stamp associated with said probability; using said time stamp for determining said elapsed time (see sections II-III) which is not disclosed by Bhatia. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these teaching for the simple purpose of maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources.

As to claim 6, Bhatia discloses the method wherein said adjusted initial call request block probability allows fewer numbers of mobile stations to initiate call requests than a number of mobile stations allowed to initiate call requests at a time of said initial call request block probability (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41).

Regarding claims 8-9, 12 and 19, they are the corresponding apparatus claim of method claim 1, 3, 6. Therefore, the claims are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claims 14-15 are the corresponding system claim of method claim 1, 3, 6. Therefore, claim 14-15 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claim 24 is the corresponding means plus function claim of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claim 25 is the corresponding storage medium claim of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected for the same reason shown above.



11. Claims 7, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view of Siwko as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 19 above, and further in view of Redden.

As to claims 7, 13 and 18, the prior references do not disclose the following limitation taught by Redden. Redden discloses the method further comprising: receiving a time period value, wherein said adjusting occurs at least once during a time period substantially equal to said time period value (see page 12, lines 48-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these teaching for the simple purpose of maintaining the quality of service during the time that the network resources are limited.

12. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view of Siwko as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 19 above, and further in view of Redden and Weishaupt (U.S. Patent 4,493,102).

As to claims 5, 11 and 17, Bhatia discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the method of receiving a call request block termination time; terminating a call request block performed based on said adjusted initial call request block probability in a gradual process from said effective call request block termination time. Redden discloses receiving a call request block termination time; terminating a call request block (see page 11, lines 43-46). Weishaupt disclose using a gradual process (see col. 1, lines 59-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings in order to preserve the quality of service.

13. Claim 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view Redden and further in view of Siwko.

As to claim 21, Bhatia discloses in a communication system, an apparatus comprising a receiver configured for receiving at the mobile station for receiving at the mobile device an indication that the assigned quality of service is unavailable [100% call block probability]; and a processor for determining at the mobile station the current indication and when receives the indication with higher QoS the mobile station blocks a call request by foregoing origination of the call request (see col. 2, lines 38-53, col. 4, lines 34-41). Bhatia fails to disclose determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial probability. In an analogous art, Redden discloses a communication system, an apparatus comprising: a receiver configured for receiving at the mobile station call request block (admission/refusal) information as specified by a network element, and a processor configured for determining said call request block information, wherein the block probability is determined by a network element (see page 14, lines 4-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings to let the mobile station know when it is possible to transmit and make a call, without the need of the mobile station transmit when the wireless resources are not present, thereby efficiently managing the finite wireless resources. Redden does not specifically disclose wherein the call request

block information is a percentage of calls to be blocked and adjusting said call request block information. In an analogous art, Siwko discloses wherein the call request block information is a percentage of calls to be blocked and determining elapsed time of the call request block probability and adjusting said call request block information (see sections II-IV). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to determine the elapsed time and adjust the parameters accordingly since the parameters and conditions are not constants and change with time.

As to claim 22, Redden discloses the apparatus wherein said processor is further configured to use said adjusted initial call request to block a call, which is not disclosed by Bhatia (see page 14, lines 4-22).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

14. Claim 23 is allowed.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: A method for blocking a call request at a mobile station, the method comprising: receiving at the mobile station an initial call request block probability, the initial call request block probability being a percentage of calls to be blocked as specified by a network element; receiving at the mobile station a time stamp and a time period associated with the received initial call request block probability; determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial call request block probability using the received time stamp; iteratively adjusting the initial call request block probability, the number of iterations being based on the ratio of the elapsed time to the received time period;

generating a random number by the mobile station between minimum and maximum allowed values associated with the initial call request block probability; and blocking the call request at the mobile station based on a comparison of the randomly generated number and the adjusted initial call request block probability.

### ***Conclusion***

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS L. TORRES whose telephone number is (571)272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Marcos L Torres/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617